

1 DENNIS A. BARLOW, CITY ATTORNEY
(SBN 63849)
2 CAROL A. HUMISTON, SR. ASST. CITY ATTY.
(SBN 115592)
3 275 East Olive Avenue
P. O. Box 6459
4 Burbank, CA 91510
Tel: (818) 238-5707 Fax: (818) 238-5724

CITY ATTORNEY

2011 MAR 30 AM 11:00

5 RONALD F. FRANK (SBN 109076)
E-mail: rfrank@bwslaw.com
6 ROBERT J. TYSON (SBN 187311)
E-mail: rtyson@bwslaw.com
7 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP
8 444 S. Flower Street, 24th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
9 Tel: 213-236-0600 Fax: 213-236-2700

10 Attorneys for Defendant
City of Burbank

12 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

15 WILLIAM TAYLOR,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 CITY OF BURBANK and DOES 1
through 100, inclusive,,

19 Defendants.

Case No. BC 422252

Assigned to: Hon John Shepard Wiley, Jr.

Action Filed: Sept. 22, 2009

Trial Date: September 20, 2011

JOINT STATUS CONFERENCE
STATEMENT OF THE PARTIES AND
REQUEST FOR VACATING OF HEARING
SET FOR APRIL 6, 2011

Date: April 6, 2011

Time: 8:30 a.m.

Dept.: 50

24
25 Plaintiff William Taylor, Defendant City of Burbank, and Jay Jette and Eric Rosoff jointly
26 submit the following Joint Status Conference Statement responding to the Court's Minute Order
27 dated February 9, 2011, and their joint request that the Court vacate the April 6, 2011 *Pitchess*
28 Motion hearing date set by the February 9 Minute Order.

1 1. Background of the Litigation and The *Pitchess* Motion as to Jette and Rosoff

2 The instant lawsuit for wrongful demotion was filed by Plaintiff in September, 2009,
3 alleging that he was demoted by then Chief of Police Tim Stehr in retaliation for his reports of
4 alleged race discrimination and sexual harassment at the Burbank Police Department.¹ The City
5 answered, denying those allegations and raising various affirmative defenses. Plaintiff's First
6 Amended Complaint was deemed filed December 15, 2010, and it added allegations that Plaintiff
7 was wrongfully terminated by current Chief of Police Scott LaChasse. The City answered and
8 denied the amended allegations, raising various affirmative defenses as well.

9 On August 25, 2010, Plaintiff served counsel for the City with two motions pursuant to
10 *Evidence Code* §1043 titled "Motion for Discovery of Peace Officer Personnel and Other Records
11 Regarding Burbank Police Department Lieutenant Eric Rosoff," and "Motion for Discovery of
12 Peace Officer Personnel and Other Records Regarding Burbank Police Department Lieutenant
13 Jay Jette" seeking production of personnel files with the Burbank Police Department of Jay Jette
14 and Eric Rosoff. Thereafter the City and Lieutenants Jette and Rosoff filed a motion for
15 protective order concerning those *Pitchess* motions, seeking an order that if the motions were to
16 be filed then they be filed under seal -- because of what the moving parties contended was a
17 possible violation of the right of privacy of certain officers by the content of the moving papers
18 themselves. Plaintiff disagreed and opposed the motion for protective order, but agreed to
19 conditionally lodge the motions so that the Court could review them but to prevent them from
20 being publicly filed at that time. This maintained the status quo pending resolution of the
21 protective order and the filing under seal issues.

22
23 2. The Tentative Date Reserved for the Jette and Rosoff "Good Cause" Hearing.

24 On December 15, 2010, the Court held a hearing on several *Pitchess* - related motions
25 including the Motion for Protective Order as to Plaintiff's *Pitchess* motions regarding Lieutenants

26 ¹ Plaintiff alleges he was demoted from the position of Deputy Chief to the position of Captain;
27 the City contends that there was no ranked position of Deputy Chief at the time, and that the
28 removal of the Deputy Chief title was a reassignment of duties rather than a demotion.

1 Jette and Rosoff. The Court denied the requested protective order, reserved a tentative date of
2 February 9, 2011 for the "good cause" stage of *Pitchess* motion process regarding the Jette and
3 Rosoff motions, and set a January 19, 2011 date for a status conference as to that same set of
4 motions given the City's indication at the December 15 hearing of its intention to seek a writ
5 requiring that those motions be filed under seal. On December 30, 2010, the City and Lieutenants
6 Jette and Rosoff commenced the indicated original writ proceeding in the Second District Court
7 of Appeal, Division 3. It was assigned Case No. B229849.

8
9 3. Status of the Writ Proceeding, 2nd Civ. Case No. B229849


10 The City's writ petition as to the protective order for the Jette and Rosoff *Pitchess* motions
11 included a request for immediate stay, given this Court's scheduling of the "good cause" hearing
12 and other related rulings. On January 6, 2011, the Second District issued an order granting the
13 stay, prohibiting "[r]elease of any information contained in the confidential police personnel
14 records including the information set forth in the *Pitchess* motions . . . pending further order of
15 this court." On January 11, 2011, the City filed and served notice of the Court of Appeal's order.
16 On January 12, 2011, the Second District issued an order setting a hearing before the Court of
17 Appeal in the Jette and Rosoff protective order writ proceeding. The appellate hearing on that
18 writ proceeding (which has been consolidated with the hearing on the writ proceeding concerning
19 Plaintiff's *Pitchess* motion and this Court's turnover order after *in camera* review as to the
20 Gardiner investigations materials) is now set for April 13, 2011.

21
22 4. Stay or Mooting of this Court's "Good Cause" Hearing Pending Resolution of The
23 Writ Proceeding in Case No. B229849.

24 Given the appellate orders on the writ proceedings, the parties believed that the February
25 9, 2011 tentative hearing date for the "good cause" stage of *Pitchess* motion process regarding the
26 Jette and Rosoff motions was either stayed by the Court of Appeal, mooted by the writ
27 proceeding, or at least premature. Counsel apologize to the Court for not attending what they
28 understood to have been a stayed or mooted hearing on February 9.

1 The Court of Appeal has not yet resolved the writ proceeding regarding the Jette and
2 Rosoff protective order, and in light of the granting of the stay there has been no briefing in this
3 Court by the City or others regarding the "good cause" stage of the Jette and Rosoff *Pitchess*
4 motions. Since the appellate hearing as to that writ proceeding in Case No. B229849 is now set
5 for April 13, 2011, the parties jointly request that the April 6, 2011 hearing as to Plaintiff's
6 *Pitchess* motions regarding Lieutenants Jette and Rosoff be vacated and taken off calendar.

7
8 BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

9
10 By: 
11 Ronald F. Frank
12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 City of Burbank
14 STONE BUSAILAH, LLP

15
16 By: _____
17 Michael P. Stone
18 Attorneys for Jay Jette and Eric Rosoff

19
20 By: _____
21 Christopher Brizzolara
22 Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

23
24 LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY SMITH

25
26 By: _____
27 Gregory W. Smith
28 Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

03/14/2011 16:20 FAX 213 236 2700

BURKE WILLIAM

1 The Court of Appeal has not yet resolved the writ proceeding regarding the Jette and
2 Rosoff protective order, and in light of the granting of the stay there has been no briefing in this
3 Court by the City or others regarding the "good cause" stage of the Jette and Rosoff *Pitchess*
4 motions. Since the appellate hearing as to that writ proceeding in Case No. B229849 is now set
5 for April 13, 2011, the parties jointly request that the April 6, 2011 hearing as to Plaintiff's
6 *Pitchess* motions regarding Lieutenants Jette and Rosoff be vacated and taken off calendar.

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

By: _____
Ronald F. Frank
Attorneys for Defendant
City of Burbank
STONE BUSAILAH, LLP

By: Michael P. Stone
Michael P. Stone
Attorneys for Jay Jette and Eric Rosoff

By: _____
Christopher Brizzolara
Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY SMITH

By: _____
Gregory W. Smith
Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

BURKE, WILLIAMS &
SORENSEN, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

LA #4310-7886-1576 Y1

4

JOINT STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT

1 The Court of Appeal has not yet resolved the writ proceeding regarding the Jette and
2 Rosoff protective order, and in light of the granting of the stay there has been no briefing in this
3 Court by the City or others regarding the "good cause" stage of the Jette and Rosoff *Pitchess*
4 motions. Since the appellate hearing as to that writ proceeding in Case No. B229849 is now set
5 for April 13, 2011, the parties jointly request that the April 6, 2011 hearing as to Plaintiff's
6 *Pitchess* motions regarding Lieutenants Jette and Rosoff be vacated and taken off calendar.

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP

By: _____
Ronald F. Frank
Attorneys for Defendant
City of Burbank
STONE BUSAILAH, LLP

By: _____
Michael P. Stone
Attorneys for Jay Jette and Eric Rosoff

By: _____
Christopher Brizzolara
Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY SMITH

By:  _____
Gregory W. Smith
Attorneys for Plaintiff William Taylor

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Theresa Nevarez, declare:

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 444 South Flower Street, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California 90071-2953. On March 28, 2011, I served a copy of the within document(s):

**JOINT STATUS CONFERENCE STATEMENT OF THE PARTIES AND
REQUEST FOR VACATING OF HEARING SET FOR APRIL 6, 2011**

- ☐ by transmitting via facsimile the document(s) listed above to the fax number(s) set forth below on this date before 5:00 p.m.
- ☒ by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below.
- ☐ by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed _____ envelope and affixing a pre-paid air bill, and causing the envelope to be delivered to a _____ agent for delivery.
- ☐ by personally delivering the document(s) listed above to the person(s) at the address(es) set forth below.

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on March 28, 2011, at Los Angeles, California.


Theresa Nevarez

SERVICE LIST

Gregory W. Smith, Esq. Attorneys for William Taylor
Law Offices of Gregory W. Smith *Real Party In Interest*
9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 345E
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Telephone: (310) 777-7894
Facsimile: (310) 777-7895

Christopher Brizzolara, Esq. Attorneys for William Taylor
1528 16th Street *Real Party In Interest*
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Telephone: (310) 394-6447
Facsimile: (310) 656-7701

Michael P. Stone, SBN 91142 Attorneys for Doe Officers
Stone Busailah, LLP 1-10
200 E. Del Mar Boulevard, Suite 350
Pasadena, CA 91105
Telephone: 626-683-5600
Facsimile: 626 683-5656

Linda Miller Savitt, Esq.
Philip L. Reznik, Esq.
Ballard Rosenberg Golper & Savitt, LLP
500 North Brand Boulevard, 20th Floor
Glendale, CA 91203-9946

Dennis A. Barlow, City Attorney
Carol A. Humiston, Sr. Asst. City Attorney
275 East Olive Avenue
Post Office Box 6459
Burbank, CA 91510
Telephone: (818) 238-5707
Facsimile: (818) 238-5724